

INTERVIEW SUMMARY ATTACHMENT

This attachment is provided to complete a telephonic interview conducted on

March 6, 2009.

Examiner views prior art document US # 6,445,961 to Melvin as proper to rely upon and in correspondence with language of independent claim 1 as it was amended.

The attorney presented arguments that memory in Melvin is not equivalent to the claimed "evaluation unit". However examiner finds the memory RAM in combination with the processor and programming able to have claimed connections and perform inherent functions related to evaluation, comparing, judging and etc.

Applicant will find a copy of previously issued final rejection mailed on 11/12/2008 including highlighted corrections of discrepancies identified in the interview summary. (see page 1).

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 08/25/2008. The previous discussion is moot due to the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Keep with next

Deleted: summary

Comment [B51]: normally I would expect to see a summary of the interview. For example, the attorney presented arguments that the memory of Melvin is not equivalent to the claimed ... however the examiner finds the memory in combination with the processor and programming perform the claimed functions of ... Also you should identify what "discrepancies" were identified.

Formatted: Keep with next

Deleted:

Comment [B52]: normally I would expect to see a summary of the interview. For example, the attorney presented arguments that the memory of Melvin is not equivalent to the claimed ... however the examiner finds the memory in combination with the processor and programming perform the claimed functions of ... Also you should identify what "discrepancies" were identified.

Deleted: Examiner views prior art document US # 6,445,961 to Melvin as

Deleted: a pertinent to rely

Deleted: proper to rely upon and in correspondence with language of independent claim 1 as it was amended.¶

Deleted: mute

Deleted:

Deleted: based on

Deleted: for

2. Claims 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Melvin US # 6,445,961.

With respect to claims 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38 Melvin discloses a controller that controls variables closely to set point, by making sequential corrections to the level of input to the system of the variable based on system response time, relationship of controller output to the variable, deviation of the variable from set point, and change in system load as determined by change in error and change in system input, (see abstract).

- Claimed at least one actuation element, shown in Fig. 3 as motors 11 and 13;
- Claimed plurality of sensors is shown in Fig. 3 as sensors 15 and 17, that adapted to detect controllable variables that are direct function of system input, (see col. 4, lines 49-60);
- A first data bus presented in Melvin teaching as bus 59, shown in Fig. 1;
- Evaluation of sensed data is conducted via controller that provided
with microprocessor interconnected with RAM. Sensed data of at
least one sensor and actuator outputs are stored/collected for
intended task in RAM 54. RAM 54 is connected via bus 59 and I/O
register 60. Wherein I/O registers 60 provided, beside the others, with two analog to digital converters 61 and 62 allowing for multiple A/D connections. One of which is analog input 72 from a variable sensor. In Fig. 3 Melvin shows coupling of motor speed sensors 15 and 17 to

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: Inherently

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: and microprocessor.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

controller, wherein coupling of motor speed sensors inputs to available
A/D converter is shown in Fig. 1, (see col. 7, lines 52-67 and col. 8, lines
1-3);

Deleted: such

Deleted: inherent to Melvin teaching
as

Deleted: to available A/D converter

- Claimed controller adapted to control the actuator presented in Melvin teaching as microprocessor 50;
- A second bus presented as bus 58 connecting evaluating unit RAM 54 with microprocessor 50. Fig. 1 shows connection of the second bus 58 to I/O register 60 having analog control to controlled input 74, that represents control of motor/actuator.

With respect to claims 24, 33, 34, 39 claimed fault signal is interpreted as error between set point and detected values, (see col. 8, lines 40-47). Also Fig. 1 shows connection of microprocessor 50 to first bus 59 and second bus 58, wherein sending signals from processor to actuator can be achieved via first and/or second bus.

With respect to claims 40 and 41, use of different first and second bus protocols is inherent for provided in Melvin teaching data communication.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 19-22, 28-30 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita Leykin whose telephone number is (571)272-2066. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Benson can be reached on (571)272-2227. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rita Leykin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2837

/Rita Leykin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2837